

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-10 are pending in the application. Claim 1 is in independent form.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the instant application in view of the following remarks.

Rejections under 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 3-7 8/1, 9 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly being obvious over Nomura, et al. (US Patent No. 5,948,991), in view of Watanabe, et al. (US Patent No. 6,260,417). Applicants respectfully submit the cited references fail to teach, disclose or suggest each of the limitations of the pending claims.

I. The Pending Claims are Patentably Distinct from the Cited References.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

A pressure sensor comprising:
a base;
a pressure-sensitive section which receives pressure
and is mounted on said base...
and a sensor package which encloses said pressure
sensitive section and forms said port...
wherein said pressure-sensitive section and said
sensor package are affixed to said base by a fluoroc
elastomer.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references taken alone or in combination do not teach, disclose or suggest the elements recited in independent claim 1.

Regarding independent claim 1, the Examiner acknowledges that Nomura, et al. "lacks the detail of the affixing by the use of a fluoroc elastomer." (See, Office Action, page 2, ¶ 4).

As such, the Examiner alleges, "Watanabe et al. discloses the use of a fluoric elastomer (e.g., phlorosilicone adhesive 5)." (See, Office Action, page 2, ¶ 4). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's conclusion.

The phlorosilicone of Watanabe is not a fluoric elastomer as required by all the pending claims. Applicants submit that Watanabe's "phlorosilicone based adhesive" is not a fluoric elastomer, but instead, corresponds to a silicon resin. More specifically, Applicants submit that the term "phloro" corresponds phlorizin, as opposed to fluorine. Moreover, as discussed in the instant application's specification, silicon resin has a relatively low chemical resistance when compared to the claimed fluoric elastomer. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claimed pressure sensor with a pressure-sensitive section and a sensor package affixed to a base by a fluoric elastomer is not obvious in light of the cited references, taken alone or in combination.

For at least this reason, Applicants submit that all of the pending claims are patentably distinct from the cited references.

II. Claims 5-7 are also patentably distinct from the cited references for additional reasons.

In addition to the reasons discussed above, claims 5-7 recite affixing a pressure-sensitive section and/or a sensor package to a base using fluoric elastomer. Applicants submit that the combination of Nomura, et al. and Watanabe, et al. do not teach, disclose or suggest the fluoric elastomer which affixes the base to the pressure-sensitive section and/or the sensor package as recited in claims 5-7.

The Examiner acknowledges Nomura does not disclose using fluoric gel to affix a pressure-sensitive section and/or a sensor package to a base. Instead, the Examiner relies on Watanabe as allegedly disclosing these claim elements. Watanabe's first protective member (7) is not provided for affixing a pressure-sensitive section (sensor chip 2) to a base (resin package 1), but is provided for protecting leads (bonding wires 6). More specifically, the first protective member does not correspond to a resin layer as disclosed in the instant application, but instead may be compared to a lead sealing section as disclosed in the instant application.

Further, in the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the first protective member (7) and the phlorosilicone based adhesive (5) of Watanabe are the same material. However, Watanabe's specification and figures do not support this assertion. For example, in Watanabe's Fig. 1, the first protective member (7) and the phlorosilicone based adhesive (5) are illustrated as different members. (See, Watanabe, Fig. 1). Accordingly, Applicants submit that the cited references do not teach, disclose or suggest a fluoric elastomer that affixes the base to the pressure-sensitive section and/or the sensor package, as recited in claims 5-7. Therefore, Claims 5-7 are patentably distinct from the cited references for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION


Applicants submit the claimed invention recited in independent claim 1 is clearly patentably distinct from the cited references, taken alone or in combination for at least the reason, discussed above, among others. Furthermore, in view of the fact that independent claim 1 is distinguishable from the cited references, Applicants submit that the dependent claims 3-10 of the instant application are also distinguishable for at least similar reasons. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 3-10 are patentably distinct from the cited reference and therefore, request withdrawal of this ground of rejections.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 03-1240, Order No. 14998-270. In the event that an additional extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 03-1240, Order No. 14998-270.

Respectfully Submitted,
CHADBOURNE & PARKE, L.L.P.

Date: September 2, 2005

BY: 
Daniel C. Sheridan
Registration No. 53,585

Address:
Chadbourne & Parke, L.L.P.
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, NY 10112
212-408-5100 Telephone
212-541-5369 Facsimile